

REMARKS

In the above referenced case, claims 125-128 are pending. Applicant will sequentially address the issues raised by the Examiner.

I. The 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 125-128 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Atarashi et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,172,254 (“ATARASHI”) in view of Konno, U.S. Patent No. 4,497,015 (“KONNO”).

Independent claims 125 and 127 have been amended to recite at least:

“[i] (means for) converting the randomly changing orientation of a chosen component of electric field vectors of said primary beam into substantially the same predetermined orientation of a chosen component of electric field vectors;  
[ii] separating the primary beam of light having the same predetermined orientation of a chosen component of electric field vectors into two or more primary color beams of light, each of the primary color beams having the same selected predetermined orientation of a chosen component of electric field vectors as that of the other primary color beams;....”

ATARASHI discloses a projector that includes a beam splitter 13 which separates the source beam into two beams having different polarizations (i.e., P and S).<sup>1</sup> Each separated source beam having either the P or S polarization is then further separated by color. The projector disclosed in ATARASHI does not convert the source beam into the same polarization before separating it by color.

Based on the foregoing amendments, all pending claims (i.e., claims 125-127) should be in condition for allowance.

---

<sup>1</sup> “[I]n FIG. 5, random polarized light emitted from a light source 11 is condensed by a paraboloidal condenser mirror 12, is irradiated toward a polarized light beam splitter 13, and is separated into P and S polarized light components by the beam splitter 13.” ATARASHI, col. 7, lines 22-26.

II. Previous Arguments

The Examiner was not persuaded by Applicant's arguments in the response filed on September 13, 2004. Applicant hereby expressly retracts those arguments in their entirety.<sup>2</sup>

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would help advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Roxana H. Yang  
Registration No. 46,788

PATENTESQUE LAW GROUP, LLP  
P.O. Box 400  
Los Altos, CA 94023  
(650) 948-0822

---

<sup>2</sup> Such retracted arguments should, therefore, not form the basis for any claim construction or prosecution history estoppel.